IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
FARAD CONTINUNATION SHEET
C.A.NO.127/2007 IN R.P.ST.NO.20165/2006 IN S.A.NO.899/2005
AND
C.A.NO.128/2007 IN R.P.ST.NO.20160/2006 IN S.A.NO.869/2005

.....

Office Notes,Office memorandum of Coram, appearances,Court's orders or directions & Registrar's orders.	**Court's or Judge's orders**

.....

Mr.A.P.Rege for the Applicant
Mr.P.Chavan for Respondent Nos.2 to 4.

CORAM: A.S.OKA, J.
DATE : AUGUST 17,2007.

P.C.:

1. The learned Advocate for the Applicant states that the first Respondent is duly served and he will file Affidavit of service. The second to fourth respondents are represented by an Advocate.

2. The applications for condonation of delay is opposed by the learned counsel for the second to fourth respondents by pointing out that there is no sufficient cause. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, delay of 89 days deserves to be condoned. Accordingly, applications are allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a). Place the Review Petitions for admission on 5th September 2007.

JUDGE